



TITLE:

ECONOMICS AND MORALITY

AUTHOR(S):

Tajima, Kinji

CITATION:

Tajima, Kinji. ECONOMICS AND MORALITY. Kyoto University Economic Review 1927, 2(1): 1-26

ISSUE DATE:

1927-07

URL:

<https://doi.org/10.11179/ker1926.2.1>

RIGHT:

Kyoto University Economic Review

MEMOIRS OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS
IN
THE IMPERIAL UNIVERSITY OF KYOTO

VOLUME II 1927

PUBLISHED BY THE DEPARTMENT
OF ECONOMICS IN
THE IMPERIAL UNIVERSITY OF KYOTO

55002019

KYOTO UNIVERSITY
ECONOMIC REVIEW

MEMOIRS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF
ECONOMICS IN THE IMPERIAL
UNIVERSITY OF KYOTO

VOLUME II

(July 1927)

NUMBER I

ECONOMICS AND MORALITY

PART I

PROPERTY OF MORALITY

How and why is it that Man is said to be 'Lord of Creation'? That is a very old thesis on which various opinions or expositions of many thinkers and philosophers have been given. For instance, a certain thinker maintains that it is because man alone is capable of producing tools and implements, by means of which he is enabled further to produce things, while birds and beasts have not. Another points us to the fact that man has, while birds and beasts have not, "the natural propensity to truck, barter, and exchange one thing for another." (Adam Smith: *Wealth of Nations*. Bk. I, ch. 2.) Get another ascribes it to Man's being by nature a political animal. (Aristotle)

Each of these views has its own truth. However, a view far more correct methinks, than any of the foregoing is that of Hsun Tzu, an ancient Chinese philosopher, who

puts it as follows: "Fire and water are given activity, but not life; trees and plants are given life, but not intelligence; birds and beasts are given intelligence, but not a sense of justice. Man is endowed with all of those qualities—activity, life, intelligence, and sense of justice. Hence under the sun man is the noblest being. A bull has more strength, and a horse can run faster than man, but they are at his beck and call. That is simply because man is enabled to be gregarious, while the bull and the horse are not. How is it that man is enabled to be gregarious? Because he knows how to do his duty. How is it then that man is enabled to do his duty? Because he is endowed with the sense of justice." (*The Hsun Tzu*: Wang Chih P'ien 荀子王制篇).

By the words, "man is enabled to be gregarious while birds and beasts are not," Hsun Tzu means that man alone, of all living creatures, is enabled to make a home, or form a village, or organize a state,—an opinion which coincides with that of Aristotle who says "Man is by nature a political animal." Hsun Tzu goes on to explain why man is thus enabled to organize a society, and says that this is due to the sterling sense of man who—as lord or subject, as father or son, as husband or wife, as senior or junior—knows how to do his (own) duty; and that the good sense of a man doing his own duty is again due to the sense of justice with which a man is naturally endowed.

The theory, according to which man is distinguished from birds and beasts with regard to whether the one or the other is possessed of the faculty of production, or the propensity to barter and exchange, is, so to say, an *Economic View*, and that of Hsun Tzu is an *Ethical View*. When we come to observe the fact that all of man's economic actions of producing and exchange, etc., are, after all, under the control of his ethical motives, through which man's love for himself or his family is developed to altruism, we should realize that the view of Hsun Tzu has a very profound and pregnant implication.

The ethical theory of Hsun Tzu is derived from Con-

fucius (孔子). Confucius the Sage, when he was asked by Lord Ai (魯哀公) of the State of Lu, (about) the best way to govern his people, gave an answer among the rest that "The Law of Humanity is jealous of the way of administration and the Law of Nature is sensitive to plants;" the idea of which I take to be coincidental with that of Aristotle, when he says "Man is by nature a political animal." "Therefore," added Confucius, "good or evil governance is dependent upon the statesmen who govern; and whether you get good statesmen or not depends upon whether you, as Lord, behave yourself worthily or not. To discipline yourself morally you have to cultivate the Law of Humanity: to cultivate the Law of Humanity you have to cultivate the virtue of Benevolence. Benevolence is no other than humanity, in which the highest virtue is filial piety. Justice means expedience, in which to hold the wise in reverence is of the greatest importance. The gradation of virtues, in which filial piety ranks foremost on the one hand and reverence for the wise on the other, gives birth to the institution of Decorum." (*The Chung Yung* 中庸).

Thus we see that the fundamental ideas of Hsun Tzu's ethical theory are based upon the foregoing teachings of Confucius. So Hsun Tzu says again: "What makes man what he is? The fact that man is gifted with the sense of discrimination. He desires food when he is hungry, warmth when it is cold, rest after toil, or loves gain and hates loss. All this is a common impulse inherent in human nature, which is dependent on nothing else and is quite as natural and identical in Yu (禹), that ideal sage-sovereign, as in Chieh (桀), the notorious tyrant. What makes man what he is, therefore, consists in his having a sense of moral discrimination, and not in his being a featherless, two-legged animal. Beasts may possess some sense of discrimination between their sire or dam and their young, but not such a sense of affection as we find between human father and son. They may have a certain sense of sexual discrimination between their males and females, but not such a sense

of propriety as exists between our sexes. So it follows that every law of humanity is always and necessarily attended with the sense of discrimination. As for the sense of moral discrimination, the sense of duty must come foremost; as for the sense of duty, the sense of decorum is most important; and with regard to decorum, that of sage-sovereigns is most typical." (*The Hsun Tzu*: Fei Hsung P'ien 荀子非相篇). A similar idea is expressed in the *Li Chi* (禮記 Book of Decorum or Propriety, one of the Five Chinese Classic Scriptures) as follows: "The parrot can prattle like a human being, yet it remains a bird; the orangoutang can articulate certain second humanly, yet it remains a beast. As long as man is destitute of a proper sense of decorum, he is a mere bird or beast, no matter how eloquently he may express himself. No sense of decorum exists among beasts. So it is that bucks, old and young, have their roes in common. This is the very reason why ancient virtuous sages laid down the code of Decorum and instructed people how to behave themselves superior to birds and beasts." (*The Li Chi*: Chu Li P'ien 禮記曲禮篇).

Now, we know that what makes man lord of creation or the noblest being in the universe lies in the fact that he has a sense of decorum and morality, both of which are outgrowths of one and the same *Self*. So runs one of the most renowned passages in the Confucian doctrines: "Heavenly endowment, that we call Nature. To act in accordance with Nature, that we call the Law of Humanity. To cultivate the Law of Humanity, that we call Education. None can dispense with the Law of Humanity, not even for a moment; else it is not entitled to be called the Law of Humanity." (*The Chung Yung* 中庸) Confucius again puts it as follows: "The Law of Humanity lies not apart from any human life; if it does so at all, in its observance, it will be unworthy of the appellation." (*ibid.*) Again he has elsewhere: "In deeds of Benevolence man is always *his own master*,—why should he reckon upon others?" (*The Lung Yu*: Yen Yuan P'ien 論語顏淵篇).

In face of these authentic truths set forth by the ancient philosophers, some modern thinkers uphold an opinion that "Man's conduct such as loyalty, filial piety, constancy, and fidelity are *Non-egoistic* or *Self-annihilative* actions." They seem to maintain that morality may have its existence outside of one's own *Self* or *Ego*. According to them, "The Annals and histories of Japan abound with instances of loyal subjects, filial sons and daughters, dutiful wives, faithful servants and chivalrous heroes, who deliberately gave up their comforts and chose hardship, or renounced honours and fortunes preferring poverty or a humble life, or sacrificed even their lives as willing martyrs for a righteous cause. These facts are only accountable in the light of the *Non-egoistic* character of the Japanese, which forms a contrast to the *Egoistic* character of some other nations." Limits of space do not allow me here to dwell upon the difference in character between the Japanese and the Westerners. However, I cannot pass without a word of comment on such a gross misrepresentation of truth as attributes the motive of all our moral actions to *Non-egoism*, because I fear it is an opinion most likely to mislead the public.

Permit me, you misconceiving thinkers, just to put you two questions. The first one is: 'Suppose you went out to the country for a solitary stroll. What do you call your action, egoistic or non-egoistic?' 'Egoistic,' you would certainly reply. 'Well,' say I, then let me ask my second question: 'Suppose you took a ramble with your little darling on your back. Which is your action then, egoistic or non-egoistic?' If you reply that it is a non-egoistic action because of the service you render in carrying your child on your back, what is it but that you are degrading yourselves to so lowly a condition as to liken yourselves to the horse or the bull, whose business it is to carry man on his back? In passing, allow me to add a few more instances.

Suppose a case of a very stingy millionaire who was

compelled to make a virtue of necessity. He contributed ten pounds towards the fund of some philanthropic work, simply because all of his charitable neighbours had set him examples, and yet he bragged of his conduct in public, saying: "I contributed a large round sum for the public good." Now the deed of this miser-millionaire is assuredly non-egoistic in the true sense of the word. Suppose, again, a coward enlisted in the army. At the front, he evaded the advance from fear of death and watched for a chance flee for his life, when he saw that some of his comrades had no sooner turned their backs on the enemy than they were shot on the spot by an officer, so the coward made a blind, desperate charge upon the enemy, though it was against the grain, but luckily he came out of the battlefield with a whole skin. On his return he professed in triumph: "It was I that repelled the enemy successfully at the risk of my life." Undoubtedly this cowardly soldier conducted himself non-egoistically, too. Now persons really benevolent or courageous are entirely different in character from the niggardly rich man or the cowardly soldier in question. The benevolent, who donate what fortunes they are possessed of towards the relief of the distressed, act in conformity with the mandate of their innermost hearts. Their action may be justly compared to the maternal love with which every mother suckles her child. The truly courageous, either setting danger at defiance or making light of their lives, rush at the hostile army, not against the grain like the said soldier but with a will, because that is an imperative command of their conscience. Their gallantry cannot be likened in any way to the motion of a bull or a horse which moves or runs in dread of the scourge.

I assert therefore that all our moral actions ought to be engendered out of *Egoistic* grounds. In other words, they ought invariably to be conformable to the spontaneous desire of our *Ego*. The idea of Confucius in reference to this problem of *Ego* may be quoted with much edification. He says, "If wealth were to be procured by honest means,

I would fain be a coachman. If not, I would rather have my own will." (*The Lung Yu: Shu Erh P'ien* 論語述而篇). Mencius expresses himself with his usual conciseness and discernment: "Fish is a dainty I like and the bear's palm is also a delicacy I like. When both are not obtainable at the same time, I shall have a preference for the bear's palm. Life is what I desire as I do righteousness. In case, however, the one is incompatible with the other, I will choose righteousness in preference to life." (*The Meng Tzu: Kao Tzu P'ien* 孟子告子篇).

From what has been stated, I believe, the reason why the ancient sages and wise men chose righteousness in preference to their lives, or why in their eyes the Law of Humanity carried more weight than worldly fortunes is quite obvious. That is to say, it was only that they acted in compliance with their predilection, or it was simply because they had no hesitation in sacrificing lesser gratifications for greater ones.

PART II

MAJOR-EGO VERSUS MINOR-EGO

"Scholars of yore studied in behalf of themselves, while modern scholars learn for the sake of others." (*The Lung Yu: Hsien Wen P'ien* 論語憲問篇). The quotation is excerpted from the well-known analects of Confucius, which I was taught to read very early, and when I came across the quoted passage—it was while quite young yst—its veracity, I confess, was open to question; because I was of opinion then that scholars are able to play their parts best by devoting themselves to the cause of the public as well as of their country, and they ought not to make much of their own interest. The doubt put me to a long and deep meditation, till at length the truth began to dawn upon me. Then I was enabled to read the text in its true light that learning in behalf of one's own self is the true way to

perfect one's own Self. "Virtue enriches one's personality: it induces one's mind to magnanimity and one's actions to nobleness," a passage from the *Chun Yu* (中庸), is to be taken as an interpretation of the state of perfection of one's self. It is self-evident, therefore, that no one can learn in behalf of others without *losing sight of his own Self.*

As for an exquisite exposition on the conception of the above-mentioned two types of scholars, we cannot do better than quote Hsun Tzu, who says: "The learning of the sage enters at his ears, penetrates into his soul, pervades all his limbs, and reveals itself in his behaviour; his word, however plain it may sound, or his effort, however slight it may appear, invariably holds up some precept or other to us. The learning of the smallminded enters at the ears and departs out of the mouth; the space between the ears and the mouth being but four inches wide, how could it possibly enrich the person that stands seven feet? 'Scholars of yore studied in behalf of themselves; scholars in modern times learn for the sake of others.' By learning the sage enlightens himself. By learning the small-minded depraves himself to the level of birds and beasts." (*The Hsun Tzu: Chuan Shueh P'ien* 荀子勸學篇). In sooth, it is a deplorable fact that even in these days we have too many learned but obsequious sycophants who truckle to influential personages, or too many erudite but servile toadeaters who cater for Croesuses. How deservedly are these ignoble scholars condemned by Hsun Tzu when he says by such use of their learning they deprave themselves 'to the level of birds and beasts'!

To learn for the sake of one's own benefit is, according to my opinion, the veritable way to *consummate one's own Self.* To consummate one's own self means to expand the *Minor-ego* to the *Major-ego*, i.e. to do to others as you would be done by. So runs the *Chun Yu*: "The Morality or Law of Humanity of the sage has its inception in the relation between man and wife, and in its consummation it manifests itself in Heaven and Earth." Again: "The

virtues of fidelity and consideration are not far off the veritable Law of Humanity. Do not do to others what you would not have them do to you." Again: "The Law of Humanity of the sage is likened to a long journey, on which you have to start from the place you stand. It is also to be compared to a mountain-ascent, which you must begin at the foot of the mountain." Again: "Sincerity is at once the beginning and the end of everything. Without it nothing is able to hold together. So it is held in high esteem by the sage. Sincerity is the veritable way to consummate not only *one's Self* but *all Things*. The consummation of self, that is Benevolence; and the consummation of things, that is Wisdom."

All these passages quoted from the *Chun Yu*, the Book of the Golden Mean, are indeed so exquisite and unique that there is not much to be added by way of exposition. Now it is obvious that every man naturally loves, not for the sake of other but for his own sake, himself with utmost tenderness, and that this springs from the sincerity, or spontaneity, of his own nature, and that the extension of the sincerity of self-love to other persons begets the virtues of fidelity and consideration. However, the consummation of the minor-ego to the major-ego is by no means attainable with facility, not at least so long as our ego is left alone as it is; in other words, it demands of us our most strenuous discipline as well as our incessant elaboration. Let me cite from the *Ta Hsueh* (大學), as an expository remark on this subject, the cultivation or refinement of the minor-ego to the major-ego, the following passage: "In olden times it was taught that, he who wants to illustrate illustrious virtue over the world shall govern his country in peace first; he who wants to govern his country in peace shall put his house in order first; he who wants to put his house in order shall cultivate his own virtue first; he who wants to cultivate his own virtue shall keep his mind upright first; he who wants to keep his mind upright shall keep his heart sincere first; he who wants to keep his heart sincere

shall acquire profound wisdom first; and he who wants to acquire profound wisdom shall make his study thorough and exhaustive first."

Kuan Tzu puts it thus: "The truth that the Law of Humanity teaches us is one and identical, but man's capacity in its embodiment causes diversities of merit. A man is enabled to put his house in order by virtue of the Law of Humanity; he is a good master of a family. By its virtue one rules well his village; he is a good ruler of a village. By its virtue one rules well his country; he is a good ruler of a country. By its virtue one rules the world; he is a good lord of the world. By its virtue one rules the universe; he is coequal with Heaven and Earth." (*The Kuan Tzu: Hsing Shih P'ing* 管子形勢篇).

Therefore, a good bachelor makes not necessarily a good husband or father, any more than an excellent banker or a successful man of enterprise makes a competent financier or an able administrator of the political economy of a state. It is for this reason that I asserted that the perfection of the Self or the Ego through the expansion of the minor-ego to the major-ego requires the most strenuous effort and incessant refinement.

The expansion of the minor-ego to the major-ego means, in other words, the furtherance of the *Individual-Ego* to the *Social-Ego*, or the promotion of the *Transitory-Ego* to the *Eternal-Ego*. In the act of cultivating the mere self or the ego man remains a *Minor-Ego*, while the regulation of one's house is an act of the *Melior-Ego*, and the well-governing of a state or the good-ruling of the world is an act of the *Major-Ego*. So a good single man is a person who cultivates both the *Individual-Ego* and the *Transitory-Ego*. When he comes to form a home his new position gives birth to various reciprocal duties between father and sons, between man and wife, or between brother and sister; and his duty, as master of a house, shall lie in treating his family as he would be treated, in acting up to the credit of his ancestors, as well as in looking after the well-being of his descendants.

Then he is acting as one of the constituents of the *Social-Ego* as well as of the *Eternal-Ego*, though they are of inferior grade. If the constituents of a city or town or village consist, in general, of persons who are worthy of citizenship, those persons form a Social-Ego and an Eternal-ego, of superior grade. Generally speaking the gentry in a state constitute a Social-Ego and an Eternal-Ego of the highest grade. A wise and enlightened sovereign, therefore, considers the welfare of his people as that of his own, and regards the everlasting prosperity and dignity of the state as identical with those of his own. Such is precisely what is expressed in the *Ta Shueh* as "he who illustrates illustrious virtue over the world," and is the perfection and embodiment of a *Social-and-Eternal-Ego*, in the supreme grade.

It is a remarkable and noteworthy fact that sages alone are blessed with endowment to attain the consummation of Major-Ego, even though they may live and die in utter obscurity, without ever rising to the social importance which they rightly deserve. Sakya's celebrated declaration at his birth, "I hold always my own *Self* in the Universe," and the famous saying of Confucius, "Heaven only knows—for who else is enabled to?—my true *Self*," (*The Lung Yu*: the Hsien Wen P'ien 論語憲問篇) testify to the truth that both the sages, each in his own way, attained the consummation of *their Ego, which rises above, yet pervades throughout, Time and Space*. These two sages are the very persons whom Kuan Tzu speaks of as the "Coequal of Heaven and Earth."

As for that well-known Mencian doctrine of 'the cultivation of the exalting spirit,' I take it to be no more than the expansion of the Minor-Ego to the Major-Ego. The words of Mencius are as follows: "I can fully cultivate my exalting spirit.....It is a spirit, vast and most vigorous; and if it be fed with righteousness and secured from mischief, it will expand infinitely and pervade Heaven and Earth. It is that spirit which may be espoused to Justice and Virtue, in the dearth of which qualities it is enervated. This spirit

is an internal creation of accumulated justice and virtue; not to be supplanted by any single act of external justice or virtue. The moment you permit your conscience to lose its innocence it is enervated." (*The Meng Tzu*: Kung Sung Chou P'ien 孟子公孫丑篇). The alleged 'exalting spirit' that pervades Heaven and earth is nothing but the Major-Ego—for what else shall I call it? It is to be nurtured with righteousness, because it is a spontaneous growth of internal influence, or a result of the cumulative actions of justice and virtue, and can never be replaced by any outward virtue. Perusal with appreciation of the passage in question from the *Meng Tzu* will suffice for any intelligent reader to dispel the doubt he might have entertained as to whether Morality is an action of Self-annihilation, or of Non-egoism.

Nevertheless, there are still other incredulous, sceptic thinkers who admit that the action of the head of a family who regulates a home, or that of the sovereign who governs a country, is the perfection of the Ego, yet they harbour the suspicion that the action of the members of a family who obey the orders of their head, or that of the subjects who submit to the injunctions of their sovereign, is at least non-egoistic or self-annihilative. Well they may, if they look at things as mere matters of fact—because that is always the way of looking at things with shallow-brained thinkers —, but a little ethical reflection on the true phase of affairs will surely undeceive them of their error. For the obedience, on the part of the members of a family, to the orders of the master is the best way of perfecting *their ego*, just as the submission, on the part of the subjects, to the injunctions of the sovereign, is the supreme way to consummate *their ego*. However, in case the master on the one hand looks down upon his household as so many sheep and dogs or domestic animals, and they, on the other, look upon him with indifference as a mere onlooker passer-by, but suffer themselves to be lorded over because they have to, such action is undoubtedly non-egoistic. Again, suppose the case that the sovereign looks down upon his subjects as so many

slaves, and they regard him as though he were an enemy, but are compelled to obey his commands for fear lest they should be hanged or otherwise punished, such action is evidently self-annihilative. Further, in case father and son, or man and wife, or brother and sister live together on cordial terms, loving and respecting each other, and in case lord and subjects get along in perfect unison with each other, the *Individual-Ego* will be assimilated, converted and incorporated into the *Social-Ego*, and the *Transitory-Ego* will be expanded to the *Eternal-Ego*, and the *Minor-Ego*, which is part and parcel of the very *Major-Ego*, will then be allowed to bring its function into full play, instead of losing its own existence as well as its consciousness.

To expect any average man to be a perfect sage, the influence of whose Ego is so vast and mighty that it pervades heaven and earth as well as all coming generations, would be too much. Nevertheless, each of the members of a household should be more keenly alive to the consciousness of his being a Major-Ego, when he compares himself with a single man; and each member belonging to some or other local community should be more sensible of the consciousness of his being a Major-Ego, in contrast to a tramp or vagabond; and finally each member of a nation should awake to the fact that he makes himself an essential component of the Social-and-Eternal-Ego of his nation. In that manner they should altogether eventually come to mutual aid and reciprocal support, and make their utmost efforts that all and each of them may the better share the fruition of social comforts or may the more partake of the enjoyment of social pleasures. I say the enjoyment of social pleasures. Is the extension of the Minor-Ego to the Major-Ego really the best and veracious method conducive to the enjoyment of pleasure? That is the subject which I am going to deal with in the next chapter.

PART III

PLEASURE AND PAIN

In this world there is no absolute pleasure as there is no unqualified pain. Pain is always followed by pleasure and pleasure inevitably culminates in pain. Though all of us naturally hate pain and like pleasure, it is our lot that in order to enjoy pleasure to the full we have to suffer a more or less degree of pain. Therefore we contrive to draw the greatest possible pleasure at the cost of the least possible pain, and in this contrivance originated the so-called "*Law of the Contributive Relativity of Human Pleasure and Pain.*" This law regulates not only our economic actions, but also our moral actions: nay, all our moral actions, which are at once the primary basis as well as the unerring lodestar of all our economic actions, are virtually no other than an accurate and exquisite application of the law.

Now the feelings of pain and pleasure are of property subjective and psychological, and accordingly the criterion of their estimation depends entirely upon individual susceptibility, their estimation is naturally subjected to variations, manifold and multifarious. For instance, honours and wealth, so long as they be acquired, no matter how, are a means of gratification for small-minded persons; while they are an abomination for the virtuous, unless acquired honestly. To sacrifice life in the cause of Benevolence or Righteousness is a deed delightful for the valorous, but it is an action by no means to be expected of the common run of people. Confucius once spoke of Yen Yuan, one of his very best disciples, saying: "Wise that he is, Hui (Yen Yuan)! With only a bowlful of plain meal to eat and only a gourdful of water to drink, lives he an obscure life in a slum, — a life so wretched and miserable that it would discourage any ordinary man. Yet for all the world would he never part with the pure joys of his humble life. Wise that he is,

Hui!" (*The Lung Yu*: Yung Yeh P'ien 論語雍也篇). Such a life as Yen Yuan led would have been, indeed, too grievous to bear for the generality of people, though it was one too blissful for the wise to part with for all the world. In fact, while in the life so much enjoyed by the wise there is something quite inapprehensible for common men, the wise do not recoil from leading a certain sort of life which ordinary people usually complain of.

It stands to reason that there should arise such a wide difference in the estimation of plain and pleasure between the wise and the vulgar. According to Confucius, "Happiness lies even in a simple life, with only a bowlful of plain meal to eat, and a gourdful of water to drink, and with but one's arms to pillow the head on. Honours and wealth, acquired in dishonest fashion, are like a fleeting cloud, as they seem to be." (*The Lung Yu*: Shu Erh P'ien 論語述而篇). He goes on to say, "If wealth were to be procured by honest means, I would fain be a coachman. If not, I would rather have my own way." (*ibidem*) Now as for what was considered veritable pleasure by Yen Yuan or Confucius, we believe we had best quote their own words, for they will speak most fluently for themselves. Confucius the Sage says of Yen Yuan, his best disciple: "In Hui (Yen Yuan 顏淵) I find a virtuous wise man who chooses the Golden Mean as his principle, and who, whenever he acquires a new truth or virtue, lays it to heart with all reverence and never loses sight of it." (*The Chung Yun* 中庸). The panegyrical remarks of Yen Yuan the Wise on Confucius and his teachings are: "I am utterly struck with wonder by the profundity of his teachings. The more I pursue my subject, the more they grow abstruse; the better I prosecute my study, the more they become recondite. They baffle description, defy comparison, or set any conception at naught. Our master, however, inculcates his admirable precepts systematically upon our minds. He enlightens me with knowledge and puts me under the control of decorum so subtly that I cannot help pursuing my study with increas-

ing interest. In knowledge as well as in moral discipline I have already done my utmost in following him, to the exhaustion of my best ability; yet my master always remains inaccessible like a mountain of immeasurable height." (*The Lung Yu*: Tsu Han P'ien 論語子罕篇).

Let me add one more quotation from Mencius, in which his idea about veritable pleasures are more clearly set forth. "The sage has three pleasures, with which the happiness of being a king of the world has nothing to do. To have both parents alive, sound and sane, and brothers and sisters living in peace, free from any harm and reproach: that is the first pleasure. To have a clean conscience conscious of having done nothing wrong in the sight of Heaven and Man: that is the second pleasure. To have talented youth of promise of the age collected under his feet and educate them: that is the third pleasure." (*The Meng Tsu*: Ching Hsing P'ien 孟子盡心篇) Can we not realize, from the foregoing quotations, in what consisted the pleasure of the sage and wise? May we not safely conclude that the view of some modern thinkers who assert that the conduct of sages or of the wise or of heroes are actions of deliberate sacrificing of their own pleasures to the interest of others, that is, are actions non-egoistic and self-annihilative, is a gross and unconscionable misrepresentation?

Nevertheless, even sages and the wise are human, and they share therefore most feelings of pain and pleasure in common with ordinary people, in spite of the fact, as has been mentioned, that they have agonies and enjoyments of their own. Hsun Tzu (荀子) puts it thus: "Man, in general, is endowed with sensations in common or identical propensities. He desires food when he is hungry, warmth when he is cold, rest after toil, and loves gain and hates loss. All this is a common impulse inherent in human nature, which is dependent on nothing else, and is quite as natural and identical in Yu (禹), that ideal sage-sovereign, as in Chieh (桀), the notorious tyrant." (*The Hsun Tzu*: Jung Ju P'ien 荀子榮辱篇) Consequently when sages or wise men

come to administer the affairs of a state and institute decorum for people, it is the interests of the people at large, *i. e.*, the diminution of general suffering and the promotion of the universal enjoyment of the public, that they always have at heart. Therefore, "Those lords who can identify people's likings with their own likings and people's dislikes with their own dislikes, are worthy of the name 'Parents of the People,'" says the *Ta Hsue* (大學).

Likewise, scholars of economics who treat of man's economic actions, or any governments in civilized states when they execute their social policies, have nothing in view but the welfare or interests of the common people, or of the average man, in society. Now because man, as lord of creation, is gifted with the capacity of ever improving and elevating himself both mentally and physically, sages and wise men, whose vocation it is to rule and instruct people, make efforts, and that with reason, to enhance the moral standard of the average man; in other words, they strive to enlarge the minor-self of the average man to the major-ego. To achieve this object, compulsion is not necessarily needful to enforce on people what they dislike; on the contrary, people are only to be induced to choose for themselves between good and evil, or pleasure and pain, in the light of the "Law of the Contributive Relativity of Human Pleasure and Pain," and to let them pursue what they think best. This idea is expressed briefly and to the point by Confucius (*The Lung Yu: Wei Cheng P'ien* 論語爲政篇) in this wise: "As long as you lead people with some policy or other, and your recourse of putting them in order is penalty, they shall be lost to the sense of shame, leaving no stone unturned to evade the law. Lead your people with virtue and put them in order by means of propriety; not only will they awake to the sense of shame, but will come to behave themselves to their credit." And he says elsewhere (*The Lung Yu: Wei Cheng P'ien* 論語爲政篇): "Suppose an innovation were introduced into the State of Sei (齊), she would come up, in rank or stage of her civiliza-

tion, to the state of Lu (魯). Another innovation, introduced into the State of Lu, and she would attain the standard of the Law of Humanity (*i. e.* the highest ideal stage in Confucian civilization." (*The Lung Yu*: Yung Yeh P'ien 論語雍也篇) In view of the foregoing observations, it is obvious that the moral standard of the average man in any state is subject to the vicissitudes of either exaltation or degradation, according to the relative merits or demerits of the educational and the administrative policies in that state.

While, it goes without saying, the maintenance of national dignity and the elevation of the national standard of living are dependent upon the national morality, it must be acknowledged that the enhancement and the degeneration of national morality, so far as the average man is concerned, are influenced by conditions of national economy. Kuan Tzu (管子) says therefore: "When granaries are full of crops, people begin to appreciate Decorum. When people are fed and clad competently, they grow sensible of honour and disgrace." (*The Kuan Tzu*: Mu Min P'ien 牧民篇) Mencius's opinion on this subject is laconically expressed in the following passages of the Liang Hui Wang P'ien (梁惠王篇) and the Kao Tzu Pien (告子篇) in the *Meng Tzu*. "No people, the learned class excepted, can be expected to possess constancy of purpose, without a competence." "A good year turns out good youth, a bad year bad youth." We observe also that Aristotle likewise has: "Poverty is the mother of crimes and revolutions." (*The Politics*. Bk. 4.)

It is on these grounds that ancient sages or wise men who took the responsibility of establishing peace in their countries, made a point of enriching their peoples. Thus one of the most wonderfully enlightened ideas is expressed in the Imperial Address of the Chinese Emperor Yao (堯), which was delivered some three thousand years ago on the occasion when he abdicated the throne in favour of Shun (舜), his successor: "Observe the precepts of the Golden Mean, by all means. Remember that were all the land impoverished,

the heavenly boon would come to an end for ever." (*The Lung Yu*: Yao Yuen P'ien 論語堯曰篇) Let me quote further a few passages from the *Shang Shu* (尚書), one of the Five Chinese Classic Scriptures, which is an historical record of statesmanship, written about three thousand years ago: "Oh, the time! Food is the first consideration!" (Yu Shu: Shun Tien 虞書舜典. *ibid.*) "Of the virtues of a ruler, good governance is a first requisite, and in good governance the feeding of the people has the first claim." (Ta Yu Mo 大禹謨. *ibid.*) In the Chou-Shu Hung-Fan (周書洪範), of the same classics, are itemized the functions of the state affairs, of which the two headings of Food Administration and Commodity Administration take precedence of all the rest.

I may also adduce the following dialogue between Confucius and his disciple Jan Yu (冉有) by way of illustration that Confucius, too, attached much importance to this subject. "The Master, Confucius, visited the State of Wei (衛), in which journey he was accompanied by Jan Yu. 'What a populous country is Wei!' said the Master. 'Indeed it is, Master. What is to be done for her now?' asked Jan Yu. 'Enrich the people,' was the reply. 'What more will be desired, when people are enriched?' 'Educate them.'" (*The Lung Yu*: Tzu Lu P'ien 子路篇). In answer to a question put by Tzu Kung (子貢), another eminent disciple, as to the requisites of statesmanship, Confucius said: "Provide your people with ample food, strengthen your country with adequate military power, and you shall have so acted to win the confidence of your people." (*The Lung Yu*: Yen Yuan P'ien 顏淵篇) Now if you approach the subject of state affairs from the standpoint of theoretical importance, the confidence of the people comes foremost, and next comes the competence of the people, and the question of military power, last of all. If, however, you treat the subject according to the due order of administrative policy, precedence must be given to the problem of food, and next in importance stands that of arms. In fine, it is only after the acquisition of a competence on the part of the people and

the completion of the armaments of a country, that the ruler can count upon the fidelity of his people.

In conclusion, a word of vindication may not be out of place for my reiterated citations from the adages and scriptures of our ancient sages and wise men. I hope my readers will not look upon me as a bigoted adherent of the old classical school. I have merely stated my firm belief that what you call economic policy in modern times is in substance almost identical with the administrative policy on food and commodities advocated in those classical ages, as I have already indicated, and that the tenets of modern social policy, so called, have their exact counterparts in that administration of Benevolence and Justice which has been upheld in Confucianism since more than two thousand years ago. In this essay, which consists of an excerpt, that is four chapters, from my treatise entitled *Economics and Morality*, I intended to point out that certain policies recently advocated in modern civilized nations are not always or necessarily the invention of modern minds, but we can trace back their origin to the profound and judicious minds of very remote antiquity, and thus by calling up testimony to these veracious facts, I should like to call the attention of scholars to the study of our classical learning.

PART IV

MORAL ACTION AND ECONOMIC ACTION

Good is the object of moral action and interest that of economic action. For instance, suppose the case of a man who attends on his parents with utmost devotion; that is a moral action. If he attend to his farming with as much assiduity, that is an economic action. Suppose, again, he gathered in the crops which are the fruit of his assiduous labour, and thereby he is far better able to provide for his parents. In that case, good and interest go together, and a moral action is in harmony with an economic action.

As a matter of fact, however, good and interest in this world do not always go together, or putting it in another word, morality and economy frequently run counter to each other. We have all seen or read of many an instance where good, virtuous people suffered from poverty, and very wicked people enjoyed their ill-gotten wealth. How shall we reconcile these incongruous facts to our conscience? According to our view, we can distinguish two types of good, *i. e.* Major-good and Minor-good, even as we can distinguish two kinds of interest, *i. e.* Major-interest and Minor-interest. The ideal perfection of morality as well as of economy consists in the promotion of minor-good to the higher point of major-good, as well as in the furtherance of minor-interest to the larger extent of major-interest; that is to say, it lies in the consummation of the Minor-ego to the Major-ego.

In most cases the minor-good may go in concert with the minor-interest, though not always; while it is an undeniable fact that the minor-good inevitably runs counter to the major-interest, just as the major-good does to the minor-interest. Therefore it is that some superficial thinkers maintain that moral actions do not necessarily harmonize with economic actions. I will concede that such a view is not utterly erroneous; none the less I assert that such is a very superficial and specious view as may mislead the public in the same way as I have already pointed out elsewhere, in connection with the misconceived view about the self-annihilative nature of morality. It is my firm conviction that the major-good is always in accord with the major-interest, in other words, higher morality ought to be always in concert with higher economy. Let me adduce some further instances and cite our classical authorities in illustration of my assertion.

I shall begin with the case where minor-good runs counter to major-interest. Suppose you came across a poor man in the street who was dying of hunger and you gave him food or money, that is a moral action of minor-good. Suppose, again, you induced farmers in your country to lay

up part of their crops in abundant years so that you might save many poor souls from starvation in bad years, your action is a major-good. Now those judicious persons, who lay down far-reaching schemes for the purpose of some major-good, ignore at times actions that may derive a certain amount of minor-good; and very very near-sighted persons often commit an absurd fault in disparaging them on that account. Let me quote a passage from Mencius, the so-called Next Supreme-Sage, in which he cited an instance of the morality in question and expressed very intelligently his opinion on the best statesmanship.

"Tzu Chan (子產), a wise statesman of the State of Cheng (鄭), assumed the reins of government. He then denied himself the comfort of using his state sedan-chair, and employed the vehicle for the benefit of the public service to convey wayfarers across the Ching and the Yu, two rivers. Mencius says: 'Benevolent as Tzu Chan is, he knows not the way to govern his country. As a matter of fact, (it is so prescribed in accordance with the river-improving system, which had been instituted by ancient sages, that), taking advantage of the leisure season of farmers every year, footbridges should be re-constructed in November, and vehicular-bridges in December. That is because before November, the season of the year when it begins to be cold, people would not mind fording the waters as yet. If a statesman were wise enough to rule his country with equity and rectitude, that would suffice. He may well suffer his people even to make way for him whenever he goes out. How should he trouble himself about the conveyance of a few people, instead of letting them wade the rivers for themselves? Were he to endeavour to satisfy each and every want of the people, all his lifetime would not be long enough'." (*The Meng Tzu*: Li Lou P'ien 孟子離婁篇).

The act of Tzu Chan, who ordered that his people should be carried across the two rivers instead of suffering them to wade, is a minor-good. On the other hand, if any statesman succeeded, as has been mentioned above, in pre-

vailing upon the people to construct bridges over unbridged rivers, taking advantage of the spare time in farming, his action which conduced to the public good is a major-interest. *Apropos*, Menciu's criticism of Tzu Chan must not be taken as a mere disparagement of one Tzu Chan, but as an admonition of the sage in which he urges the purport of statesmanship in general.

Next, let us take up the case where minor-interest disagrees with major-good. Suppose a rice merchant who, anticipating a bad year to come, forestalled the market, which caused an excessive enhancemet in the price of rice, and he profiteered as a matter of course and made an unreasonable gain. In this case, it is only one merchant that earned an exorbitant profit, and the sufferings of a great mass of people might eventually give occasion to the increase of offenders and malefactors. Is it not self-evident then that any faithful statesman, whose duty it is to promote the major interest of society, has sometimes to have recourse to the suppression of the minor-interest of a minority?

Another instance. Suppose the case that gambling and lottery are publicly granted or sanctioned by the government. Though a minority, as luck might have it, may realize millions of millions, there also may be a far larger proportion of people who suffer great losses or damage. What is worse, however, the good habits in society of thrift and diligence would be corrupted, and the commendable virtues of simplicity and righteousness would disappear. We find in modern civilized countries a deplorable fact that a comparatively small number of people, who are invariably some industrial monopolists, what by means of legally recognized engrossments, natural forestallations, capitalistic monopolies, and such devices accumulate enormous wealth. But as such wealth, however immense it may be, belongs to the exclusive possession of quite a limited circle, and is of property that cannot be distributed universally among all classes of people, it is just the sort of interest to be designated as minor-

interest. Moreover, the fact that the interests of society in general fall into the hands of some very few monopolizers, brings about a serious disparity between the rich and the poor, deprives society of its balance of wealth, and leads probably to the provocation of grave social troubles, such as interclass class struggles, and the like.

In the above delineation we saw that minor-good is not seldom incompatible with major-interest, and that minor-interest cannot frequently coexist with major-good. Now it remains for us to prove the case where major-interest always works in harmony with major-good. What is major-interest? By major-interest is meant *the enjoyment of the utility of wealth*, which extends universally to all classes of society and reaches permanently every stage in social civilization. And what is major-good? By major-good is meant *the security of good habits and commendable customs*. At the time when every class in society is enabled to enjoy universally and permanently the utility of wealth, its habits and manners would not fail naturally to be refined and become respectable, while in the train of refined habits and respectable manners should invariably follow the economical development of society.

The sacred tie between man and wife is of supreme importance in our society, because therein lies the inception of morality. When, for instance, man and wife come to live in perfect accord, their relations give rise to the division of work and the spirit of mutual aid. When father and son love each other, their relations tend to foster the virtues of diligence and thrift. When brothers and sisters are united in relying upon one another, or when friends are in unison with one another in co-operation, such relations will give an impetus to the prosperity of trade and the flourishing of production, and the distribution of wealth itself will be well-balanced. The concordance between the ruler and the ruled will lead likewise to the security of the fruition of social benefits derived from industry and productive enterprises, first throughout a locality, and then throughout a country, and eventually throughout the world.

It is hardly necessary to remark that my opinion on this subject is based on the average man in any civilized country. So far as the average man is concerned—for here I am not dealing with any 'extraordinary' man—married people, generally speaking, enjoy the benefits derived from the division of work and mutual aid or co-operation, to a fuller extent, compared with unmarried people or those who lead a single life. At the same time, the former are more alive to the interests of industry or thrift or saving. And, what is better, married people have invariably a stronger communal spirit than unmarried people, that is, they take more active interest in the public good of their local communities, and their patriotic spirit also is far more staid.

In these days, I will admit, there is many an advocate of the single life, who professes his preference of the single life to married life, for the reason that it is an ideal form of life for enjoyment. However, in all civilized countries, so far as the average man goes, family life is recognized as the best form of life that gives us comparatively less pain and more pleasure than the single life; and the cultivation of the moral sense, together with the development of economic power, in every civilized country, will the more contribute towards the diminution of pain and the promotion of pleasure.

There is also another kind of thinkers who assert that anarchism or communism is an ideal form of government. The average man, however, in any civilized country chooses to remain as a member of, and to abide by the control of, the local community or the existent governmental system in which he is living at present, because that is regarded as the best way to give him comparatively less pain and more pleasure than otherwise. Besides, the stirring up of patriotic spirit will tend, hand in hand with the industrial development, to the decrease of pain as well as to the increase of pleasure.

Some advocates of celibacy decry not infrequently the married woman who is both a good wife and a wise mother,

designating her as a unpaid life-servant. Such persons naturally are unable to perceive the truth that what the outsiders hold as a toil or labour is not considered as such by a good wife and wise mother, but on the contrary it is a veritable boon for her from which she derives her supreme pleasure. Those anarchists and communists, who insist that all existent political institutions are not only useless but baneful, fail also to perceive the fact that anarchism has never been realized in any civilized country in this world, except for extraordinary occasions such as a revolution or a sedition or a civil war, and that only for a short duration. Communism, too, has been successful neither in Europe nor in America, though there are certain precedents where it was tentatively enforced on a very small scale.

In fine, none of the foregoing views is not accordant with the virtue of the Golden Mean. Hence, I am convinced, the grounds on which man forms a home, or organizes a society or a local community, or even a state, to which authority he willingly submits himself, and the interests of which he strives to support and promote by his steadfast and faithful conduct or by his productive and industrial labour, do not lie in the annihilation of his Self, *i. e.* in non-egoism, but they are based upon the spontaneity of human nature in his efforts to foster his minor-ego to become a major-ego. To view these facts in the light of morality, it is the expansion of the minor-good to the major-good. To observe them in the light of economics, that is nothing else but the fururance of the minor-interest to the major-interest. Thus the conclusion we arrived at is, Morality and Economics, reciprocally acting or depending upon each other, set our society in motion to its best advantage and are never incompatible with each other.

KINJI TAJIMA